

#### REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the outstanding office action dated May 9, 2003 wherein the Examiner rejected claims 1-19, all of the pending claims. Reconsideration of these rejections and allowance of all the claims in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### The Drawing Objections

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention including obtaining of the frequency variations and the using of such to acquire a second GPS signal. In response to this objection Applicants have added new Fig. 5, which is, a flow chart showing these steps as specifically recited in the claims and which does not add new matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

#### The rejections under 35 USC 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 17 stating that they fail to clearly and distinctly set forth the subject matter since each claim sets forth a method for despreading a plurality of spread spectrum signals. The Examiner further stated that the claims fail to clearly and distinctly set forth any actual step of despreading any signals. Applicants have amended these claims and also Applicants take this opportunity to explain that despreading and

acquiring are synonymous to one skilled in the art. Therefore the method of desreading includes acquiring a first signal and acquiring the second signal in accordance with the amended claims. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are now allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 14 as "not understood". Applicants are not quite clear in why this claim is "not understood" but have attempted to clarify the claim to avoid another rejection. Claim 14 merely states that the dwell time employed to acquire the second GPS signal is greater than that employed to acquire the first GPS signal. Accordingly, Applicants have amended this claim to more clearly recite this. If the Examiner is unclear about the term "dwell time" then Applicants respectfully point the Examiner to page 2 of the specification, second paragraph which discusses dwell time. Other than these changes and remarks Applicants are not clear what would remove this "not understood" rejection and respectfully request the Examiner to allow this claim to avoid undue delay in prosecution.

The Examiner rejected claim 15 as indefinite since it is dependent upon a method claim, it is not further limiting as the method already defines a method of desreading signals received by a GPS receiver and the language "able to desreading is grammatically improper. Applicants have amended this claim to more clearly recite the structure of the GPS receiver that performs the desreading and to change "able to desreading" to "able to despread". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this

claim is also allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 16 as being dependent upon a method claim. Applicants have amended this claim to more clearly recite the structure. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this claim is also allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 17 as being not understood because it is not clear why the first signal would be resampled as the first signal is defined as having been acquired. Applicants have amended this claim to make it dependent upon claim 3 and to remove these rejections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is now allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 18 and 19, these claims have been cancelled herein.

Applicants also wish to point out to the Examiner that minor grammatical errors have been corrected in the specification.

The rejection under 35 USC Section 102a and 102e as being anticipated by any one of Underbrink, Carter, Lau or Loomis under 102a and King under 102e.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections on the grounds that claims 1, 15 and 16 all of the independent claims require using information relating to variations in the frequency of a first acquired GPS signal to acquire a second GPS signal (now in the course of a single dwell). This is not the same as merely using the frequency itself which can be used to resolve local oscillator error (as disclosed in the cited documents) but which

does not help with the problem of oscillator drift after having acquired one signal but before acquiring another. None of the sections of the prior art cited appear to disclose using information relating to variations in the frequency of a first acquired GPS signal to acquire a second GPS signal. Although the Examiner did not cite the specific sections of many of the documents that is claimed to anticipate the claims, Applicants believe the Examiner is referring to the use of the frequency itself. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to point to the specific portions of the references, which he believes anticipates by using the variations in the frequency. Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over the references of record. Entry of this amendment and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Laurie E. Gathman, Reg. 37,520  
Attorney

(914) 333-9605

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On

JULY 31st 2003

By

